

On the Wavefunctional for Two Heavy Color Sources in Yang-Mills Theory*

Peter E. Haagensen and Kenneth Johnson

*Center for Theoretical Physics
Laboratory for Nuclear Science
and Department of Physics
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139*

e-mail: haagense@ctp.mit.edu, knjhnsn@mitlns.mit.edu

(MIT-CTP-2614, hep-th/9702204, February 1997)

Abstract

In an abelian gauge theory, the Coulombic potential between two static charges is obtained most directly when a correct separation between gauge-invariant and gauge degrees of freedom is made. This motivates a similar separation in the nonabelian theory. When a careful identification of the Hilbert space is made, along with the proper analyticity requirements, it is then possible to find the appropriate wavefunctionals describing heavy color sources in the theory. This treatment is consistent with, and realizes in a simple way the center symmetry Z_N of $SU(N)$ gauge theories.

Typeset using REVTeX

*This work is supported in part by funds provided by the U.S. Department of Energy (D.O.E.) under cooperative research agreement #DF-FC02-94ER40818, and by NSF Grant PHY-92-06867.

I. INTRODUCTION

Anyone who has given a certain amount of thought to different treatments of quantum electrodynamics comes inevitably to the conclusion that the reason it is a rather straightforward theory to work out is, in one guise or another, always the same: at some point, one needs to clearly separate what are physical degrees of freedom from what are gauge degrees of freedom, and this separation is absolutely clear in an abelian gauge theory. Unfortunately, no such luck persists with nonabelian gauge theories. The nonlinear nature of the theory obscures considerably this separation of physical from gauge components. One might nevertheless wonder whether a similar systematic separation of degrees of freedom is possible in the nonabelian theory as well and, if so, whether it may shed some light on different aspects of the theory in any way.

In previous work [1], we have given a description of the Hilbert space of Yang-Mills theory in terms of gauge invariant variables which, as we show in what follows, does achieve this objective without tremendous technical effort. The specific issue we address here is the form state functionals of the theory should take in the presence of two static color sources. Firstly, it is of course the nonzero charge sectors that exploit this separation of degrees of freedom. Moreover, through the static charge-anti-charge state one may also study the confining potentials generated by the theory. The central points guiding the search for these wavefunctionals are the above mentioned separation of degrees of freedom, and a proper identification of the Hilbert space of the theory. We take the view here that the only two requirements we are allowed to make are that wavefunctionals satisfy Gauss' law and that they be analytic functions in the Hilbert space of the theory. We find *a posteriori* that wavefunctionals for two static color sources satisfying these two requirements necessarily contain a dependence on some curve connecting the two charges if they belong to a fundamental representation, a behavior that is markedly different from both the abelian case and the case of nonabelian adjoint sources. The reason this behavior comes about lies in the correct identification of the Hilbert space in the nonabelian theory, which in turn comes from the observation that a pure $SU(N)$ gauge theory is in reality only an $SU(N)/Z_N$ gauge theory because of the well-known fact that the gluons, which belong to the adjoint representation, are insensitive to the center transformations, Z_N . Specifically for $SU(2)/Z_2 = SO(3)$, the description of the Hilbert space becomes particularly clear, through the use of Euler angles and variables which simply rotate under gauge transformations, and this is the case we will be concerned with here, although the extension to $SU(N > 2)$ should not present any conceptual difficulties. Analyticity and periodicity requirements in the $SO(3)$ domain will naturally lead to a simple and explicit realization of the center symmetry, through 't Hooft's operator algebra [2]. At the same time, Wilson loops are not gauge invariant under transformations generating vortices through them, and this fact would be entirely missed if the gauge group were considered to be $SU(2)$ rather than $SO(3)$, unless the nontrivial Z_2 behavior were inserted by hand, *e.g.*, through boundary conditions [3].

We begin by treating the abelian case, since this will not only motivate the correct separation of degrees of freedom in the nonabelian theory, but will also indicate some cautionary remarks concerning the physical interpretation commonly ascribed to Wilson loops, both in the abelian and the nonabelian cases. The standard procedure to obtain the potential for

two static charges in the abelian theory is to calculate the vacuum expectation value of the Wilson loop [4]

$$\langle e^{i \oint dx^\mu A_\mu(x)} \rangle \propto e^{\frac{-1}{8\pi^2} \oint \oint \frac{dx^\mu dy^\mu}{(x-y)^2}} . \quad (1)$$

However, extracting a Coulomb law from Eq. (1) requires some nontrivial steps. The integral contains divergences, and thus if one computes it for, say, a rectangular loop of sides L and T , the exact result is a function of ΛL and ΛT , symmetric under $L \leftrightarrow T$ interchange, where Λ is a momentum cutoff. The double integral then yields:

$$c_1 \Lambda(L + T) + c_2(L/T + T/L) + \dots \quad (2)$$

(the exact result will be presented below). The Coulomb law is buried in Eqs. (1,2) according to well-known arguments: one must first interpret the expectation value to mean the amplitude for creation of a charge-anti-charge pair, separated by a distance L , out of the vacuum during some finite time T . Then, one must argue away the first term as a self-energy contribution, and let T become large in order to isolate the behavior $\exp(-iT/L)$. Some further argumentation then allows one to identify the $1/L$ in this latter expression as the potential between the charges running in the loop. Altogether, we believe this entire procedure to be a bit too much calculation and argumentation. In a Hamiltonian formalism, the same result can be seen to follow in a much simpler fashion. We will also show, however, that unless one makes a judicious separation of gauge and gauge-invariant variables, one may well erroneously “derive” confinement in this theory. The lessons learned in this exercise will then serve as a guide in treating the nonabelian theory. In particular, we will show that the form wavefunctionals should take is not the one directly connected to Wilson loops, and sometimes indicated in the literature.

II. (NO) CONFINEMENT IN THE ABELIAN THEORY

Here and in what follows, we consider the Hamiltonian quantization of gauge theories in “temporal” gauge (in the abelian theory: $A_0 = 0$), and in the Schrödinger representation. States of the theory are wavefunctionals $\Phi[A]$ which are eigenfunctions of the Hamiltonian, with the further requirement that they satisfy Gauss’ law, which in the abelian theory reads

$$\partial_k \frac{\delta \Phi[A]}{\delta A_k(x)} = 0 . \quad (3)$$

If two static charges, of opposite unit charge, for definiteness, are placed at points x_0 and x_1 , states of the theory will be modified, and will in particular solve a modified Gauss law:

$$\partial_k \frac{\delta \Psi[A]}{\delta A_k(x)} = -i(\delta^{(3)}(x - x_1) - \delta^{(3)}(x - x_0))\Psi[A] . \quad (4)$$

If a functional $\Phi[A]$ satisfies Eq. (3), then the functional

$$\Psi[A] = e^{i \int_{x_0}^{x_1} dx^m A_m(x)} \Phi[A] \quad (5)$$

will satisfy Eq. (4). In the above, the line integral is taken along some curve C connecting x_0 and x_1 , and for simplicity we do not indicate explicitly the dependence of Ψ on x_0 , x_1 or C . The resemblance between this functional and the Wilson loop operator does suggest the above to be the natural candidate for the state with opposite charges at x_0 and x_1 , if Φ is the vacuum state. The electric field expectation on Ψ is obtained from

$$E^i(x)\Psi[A] = \frac{1}{i} \frac{\delta}{\delta A_i(x)} \Psi[A] = \int_{x_0}^{x_1} dy^i \delta^{(3)}(x-y) \Psi[A] - ie^{i \int_{x_0}^{x_1} dy^m A_m(y)} \frac{\delta \Phi[A]}{\delta A_i(x)}. \quad (6)$$

If we assume Φ is real – we might take, for instance, Φ to be indeed the vacuum state – there is no cross term in squaring this expression and we are led to the following electric energy expectation:

$$\begin{aligned} \int d^3x \langle E^2(x) \rangle_\Psi &= \int d^3x \langle E^2(x) \rangle_\Phi + \int_{x_0}^{x_1} dy^m \int_{x_0}^{x_1} dz^m \delta^{(3)}(y-z) \\ &= \int d^3x \langle E^2(x) \rangle_\Phi + 2L\delta^{(2)}(0), \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where L is the length of the curve C , and $\delta^{(2)}(0)$ is the inverse thickness of the curve, to be made finite by some suitable renormalization. This is minimized for C a straight line between x_0 and x_1 , and shows an electric energy growing linearly with the separation of the charges. In other words, confinement of charge as the term is usually understood.

What have we done wrong? We have simply chosen a very bad functional: taking a real Φ has eliminated the cross term in the (squared) electric energy, and has given a highly divergent contribution. It is not that the derivation is wrong, but there is a much better wavefunctional around, leading to the exact solution, and a smaller electric energy. We find it by separating the gauge variables from the gauge invariant variables:

$$A_i(x) = A_i^T(x) + \partial_i \Lambda(x), \quad (8)$$

with $\partial_i A_i^T(x) = 0$, and

$$\Lambda(x) = -\frac{1}{4\pi} \int d^3y \frac{\partial_i A_i(y)}{|x-y|}. \quad (9)$$

Inserted into Eq. (5), it leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi[A] &= e^{i(\Lambda(x_1)-\Lambda(x_0))} \left[e^{i \int_{x_0}^{x_1} dy^m A_m^T(y)} \Phi[A] \right] \\ &\equiv e^{i(\Lambda(x_1)-\Lambda(x_0))} \tilde{\Phi}[A], \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where $\tilde{\Phi}[A]$ is gauge invariant and thus still solves the source-free Gauss law, Eq. (3). The electric field now reads

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{i} \frac{\delta}{\delta A_i(x)} \Psi[A] &= \left(\frac{\delta \Lambda(x_1)}{\delta A_i(x)} - \frac{\delta \Lambda(x_0)}{\delta A_i(x)} \right) \Psi[A] - ie^{i(\Lambda(x_1)-\Lambda(x_0))} \frac{\delta \tilde{\Phi}[A]}{\delta A_i(x)} \\ &= \partial_i \left(\frac{1}{4\pi|x-x_1|} - \frac{1}{4\pi|x-x_0|} \right) \Psi[A] - ie^{i(\Lambda(x_1)-\Lambda(x_0))} \frac{\delta \tilde{\Phi}[A]}{\delta A_i(x)}. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

In squaring this expression to obtain the electric energy, the cross term vanishes without any further assumptions since $\tilde{\Phi}$ is gauge invariant and thus satisfies Eq. (3). The electric energy then reads:

$$\int d^3x \langle E^2(x) \rangle_{\Psi} = \int d^3x \langle E^2(x) \rangle_{\tilde{\Phi}} - 2 \frac{1}{4\pi|x_0 - x_1|} + \text{s.e.} , \quad (12)$$

where “s.e.” means the self-energy terms for both sources. Now we see the correct result, no confinement, just the Coulomb interaction. Whereas previously our choice of prefactor in Eq. (5) led to the singular quantity $\delta A_i(x)/\delta A_j(y) \propto \delta^{(3)}(x - y)$, the second choice led on the other hand to the smoother quantity $\delta \Lambda(x)/\delta A_i(x)$. A seemingly “natural” choice of Φ (*i.e.*, Φ the vacuum wavefunctional) then did not allow for the cancellation of this extraneous divergence.

We thus learn that when we introduce a prefactor into wavefunctionals in order to solve the Gauss law with sources, the presence of the *full* vector potential in the line integral will lead to an artificially divergent quantity; one should rather attempt to introduce only the gauge part of the vector potential. In the abelian case, the gauge part of the vector potential appears in such a way as to effectively “disconnect” the two end points where the charges are located, without introducing any discontinuities (cf. Eq. (10)); we may suspect that in a correct treatment of the nonabelian theory with fundamental sources this should not happen, as in that case one does expect a “line” to be present connecting the two sources.

It is possible in fact to derive the correct result in a simpler way by directly solving the local form of Gauss’ law, because it makes no premature use of a path: using the appropriate separation of gauge and physical variables, Eq. (8), it follows that

$$\partial_k \frac{\delta \Psi}{\delta A_k(x)} = -\frac{\delta \Psi}{\delta \Lambda(x)} , \quad (13)$$

which in turn leads to, using Eq. (4),

$$\frac{\delta \Psi}{\delta \Lambda(x)} = i(\delta^{(3)}(x - x_1) - \delta^{(3)}(x - x_0))\Psi , \quad (14)$$

which immediately gives the correct solution:

$$\Psi[A] = e^{i(\Lambda(x_1) - \Lambda(x_0))} \Phi_0[A^T] . \quad (15)$$

Further minimization in the gauge invariant sector tells us that Φ_0 is the vacuum wavefunctional. Incidentally, we note that this is not at all a new result: it can in fact be traced back to Dirac [5].

The separation of gauge and gauge invariant variables has clearly indicated that it is the longitudinal degrees of freedom which are responsible for the potential between static charges, and once that separation is made, Gauss’ law by itself allows for the computation of the potential. With that in mind, one understands why the same result is more awkward to extract from the Wilson loop, since that is an expectation value of a gauge invariant operator in the vacuum sector of the theory, which only depends on transverse variables. We have furthermore learned that the wavefunctional which is suggested by the Wilson loop, and which might seem at first more natural (Eq. (5)) in fact is incorrect, essentially

because it introduces all of the gauge field degrees of freedom, transverse and longitudinal, propagating along the line connecting the two charges. Given this result, however, one might now wonder: what has conspired to allow the Wilson loop expectation to also indicate the correct result, albeit with more effort? In order to answer this question, we first observe that the wavefunctional in Eq. (15) is an exact eigenfunction of the Hamiltonian operator

$$H = \frac{1}{2} \int d^3x \left(-\frac{\delta^2}{\delta A_i(x) \delta A_i(x)} + B_i^2(x) \right), \quad (16)$$

with eigenvalue $v_0 \Lambda^4 V + v_1 \Lambda + v_2/|x_0 - x_1|$, where v_i are constants, Λ is a momentum cutoff, V is the volume of space, the first term is a vacuum zero-point energy, the second term is a self-energy, and the last term is the Coulomb energy. Meanwhile, it is also simple to verify explicitly that the Wilson line, Eq. (5) (with Φ the vacuum functional), is *not* an eigenstate of H . In order to make contact between the Wilson loop and our calculations, we may choose to calculate the former in the gauge $A_0 = 0$, for a loop tracing a rectangle, with two fixed-time sides of length L and two sides of length T along the time direction. Due to the gauge choice, the expectation value only receives contributions from the spacelike sides. Furthermore, each of these sides corresponds to a state given by a Wilson line acting on the vacuum state, Eq. (5). Since one is at time T and the other at time 0, we may insert the operator $\exp -iTH$ in the middle in order to bring these states to the same time, and this operator can be further decomposed into its matrix elements on energy eigenstates. Then, the lowest nonvanishing overlap will give the leading exponential behavior of the loop. Because the Wilson line belongs to the sector with opposite charges at x_0 and x_1 , the lowest Hamiltonian eigenstate with a nonvanishing overlap will be precisely the eigenstate given by Eq. (15), so that the correct Coulomb behavior is obtained. If the Wilson line only had components in the higher modes within this two-charge sector, the expectation value of the Wilson loop would be even further removed from the Coulomb law.

In order to explicitly confirm the relevance of this overlap, we have performed the exact computation of the Wilson loop expectation value for a rectangle of sides L_1 and L_2 along two spatial directions. It is a lengthy computation with, however, a rather compact result: we find

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{8\pi^2} \oint \oint \frac{dx^\mu dy^\mu}{(x-y)^2} &= \frac{1}{4\pi^{3/2}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{s_0}} (L_1 + L_2) - \frac{1}{4\pi} \left(\frac{L_1}{L_2} + \frac{L_2}{L_1} \right) \\ &- \frac{1}{2\pi^2} \left(-\ln \left[4s_0 \left(\frac{1}{L_1^2} + \frac{1}{L_2^2} \right) \right] + \gamma + 2 \right) + \frac{1}{2\pi^2} \left(\frac{L_1}{L_2} \tan^{-1} \frac{L_2}{L_1} + \frac{L_2}{L_1} \tan^{-1} \frac{L_1}{L_2} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where $s_0 \rightarrow 0$ is a cutoff parameter (of dimension L^2) used to regulate the propagator in a Schwinger parametrization, and γ is the Euler constant (we have also omitted two terms vanishing in the limit $s_0 \rightarrow 0$). To orient the loop along the time direction and extract the Coulomb law, we take $L_1 \gg L_2$ and then $L_1 \rightarrow -iT$, and are left with

$$\exp \left\{ -iT \left(\frac{1}{4\pi^{3/2}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{s_0}} - \frac{1}{4\pi L_2} \right) - \frac{1}{2\pi^2} \left[\ln \left(\frac{L_2^2}{4s_0} \right) + \gamma + 1 \right] \right\}. \quad (18)$$

The first term is the self-energy contribution, the second one is the Coulomb law, and the last term is the (modulus squared) overlap of the Wilson line with the correct eigenstate,

Eq. (15). As L_2 is made larger, this overlap becomes smaller, which is expected, as for larger separations the Wilson line becomes more and more energetic, and thus further removed from the true charge-anti-charge state. Furthermore, we also see that, as the cutoff is removed, this overlap becomes vanishing. One may understand this as a renormalization of the composite operator corresponding to the Wilson line, but however one wants to interpret it, it does mean that the overlap does indeed vanish in the limit $s_0 \rightarrow 0$.

As long as the Wilson line has a nonzero overlap with the correct wavefunctional for two charges, the Wilson loop expectation value should in the end lead to the correct potential between static charges. If, for instance, on a lattice calculation one is not forced to take the analogous limit $s_0 \rightarrow 0$ in order to extract the appropriate scaling behaviors, then such a nonzero overlap may well be achieved. At the same time, however, we have seen that there are *caveats* to the full computation, even in the simpler abelian case where an exact result can be found, and in general Wilson loops should not be taken as any direct indication of what the correct wavefunctional is for a pair of static charges. Some of the literature on this subject may be a bit misleading, as sometimes it implicitly appears to assume the analogous form of Eq. (5) for the wavefunctional in the nonabelian case, and in some instances such a wavefunctional is explicitly written down [6].

III. THE NONABELIAN THEORY

Much of what we do here will be valid for general $SU(N)$ gauge group, but in order to keep the discussion sufficiently simple and explicit, we will treat the $SU(2)$ theory. In the presence of two static color sources at x_0 and x_1 , state wavefunctionals take the form

$$\Psi_{\alpha\beta}[A] , \quad (19)$$

where α and β are indices in the representation of the sources at x_1 and x_0 , respectively. Under finite gauge transformations, these states transform as

$$\Psi_{\alpha\beta}[A] \longrightarrow \Omega_U^{-1} \Psi_{\alpha\beta}[A] = \Psi_{\alpha\beta}[U A] = U_{\alpha\alpha'}(x_1) U_{\beta\beta'}^*(x_0) \Psi_{\alpha'\beta'}[A] . \quad (20)$$

For notational simplicity, we have written the same “ U ” everywhere, but of course it should be kept in mind that A transforms in the adjoint, while the U ’s at x_0 and x_1 belong to whatever representation the sources are in. Here we are mostly interested in the case in which both sources are either in the fundamental or in the adjoint. A physical wavefunctional should transform as the above under gauge transformations, and the infinitesimal statement of such a transformation is Gauss’ law in the presence of sources:

$$\left(\mathcal{G}^a(x) + i\delta^{(3)}(x - x_1)\Lambda^a - i\delta^{(3)}(x - x_0)\Lambda^{a*} \right)_{\alpha\beta, \alpha'\beta'} \Psi_{\alpha'\beta'} = 0 , \quad (21)$$

where Λ^a is an $SU(2)$ generator, either in the fundamental or in the adjoint, and

$$\mathcal{G}^a(x) = D_i^{ab} \frac{\delta}{\delta A_i^b(x)} , \quad (22)$$

with $D_i^{ab} = \partial_i \delta^{ab} + \epsilon^{acb} A_i^c$, is the infinitesimal generator of gauge transformations on functionals of A (in the above, unit matrices in $\alpha\alpha', \beta\beta'$ -space are also understood in the appropriate places).

As previously, one solution of this constraint is gotten by attaching a Wilson line prefactor to a gauge invariant functional Φ :

$$\Psi_{\alpha\beta}[A] = P \left(e^{i \int_{x_0}^{x_1} dx^m A_m(x)} \right)_{\alpha\beta} \Phi[A] , \quad (23)$$

where P stands for the usual path ordering prescription, and $A_m(x) = A_m^a(x)\Lambda^a$ is a matrix in the algebra of $SU(2)$ in the representation of the sources. This functional transforms as in Eq. (20), and consequently satisfies Gauss' law in the presence of sources. Furthermore, it is a single-valued, analytic function of the vector potential in the $SO(3)$ domain of the variables, irrespective of whether Λ^a is a single-valued representation or not. However, like in the abelian case, it leads to an extraneous divergence when calculating the electric field energy, due to the singular term $\delta A_i(x)/\delta A_j(y) \propto \delta^{(3)}(x-y)$, and we must discard it.

What we should seek, rather, is the equivalent of the abelian term $\delta\Lambda(x)/\delta A_i(x)$ in the electric energy, while at the same time preserving the transformation property Eq. (20) and single-valuedness in the $SO(3)$ domain of the variables.

The abelian example suggests that we attempt to solve Gauss' law in local form, since it led most simply to the correct result in that case. In order to do so, we have found it most convenient to utilize a set of gauge covariant variables that we have described in previous work [1]. These new variables, u_i^a , replace the vector potential through the following transformation:

$$\epsilon^{ijk} D_j u_k^a \equiv \epsilon^{ijk} (\partial_j u_k^a + \epsilon^{abc} A_j^b u_k^c) = 0 . \quad (24)$$

Unlike the vector potential, which transforms inhomogeneously, these new variables simply rotate under gauge transformations:

$$\Omega_U^{-1} u_i^a(x) \Omega_U = U^{ab}(x) u_i^b(x) , \quad (25)$$

with U^{ab} a 3×3 real orthogonal matrix. From these, furthermore, gauge invariant variables can easily be obtained by contraction in color indices: $g_{ij} = u_i^a u_j^a$. The nine degrees of freedom of A_i^a are thus clearly split between six gauge invariant degrees of freedom in g_{ij} and three $SO(3)$ (rather than $SU(2)$) gauge angles. For our considerations here, it will suffice to consider the variables u_i^a . Taken as three vectors in color space, for $i = 1, 2, 3$, they uniquely define a tetrahedron at each point of $\mathbb{R}^3$, with vertices at the origin and at the ends of the vectors. Variations in the gauge invariant variables change the shape or the size of the tetrahedron, while gauge variations simply rotate it. In terms of the new variables, the Gauss law generator reads

$$\mathcal{G}^a(x) = \epsilon^{abc} u_i^b(x) \frac{\delta}{\delta u_i^c(x)} . \quad (26)$$

To satisfy Eq. (21) in the simplest possible way, one may take a wavefunctional

$$\Psi_{\alpha\beta}[u_i^a(x); u_i^a(x_0), u_i^a(x_1)] , \quad (27)$$

which is a functional of $u_i^a(x)$ throughout space, but a regular function of $u_i^a(x_0)$ and $u_i^a(x_1)$. Then,

$$\frac{\delta\Psi}{\delta u_i^a(x)} = \frac{\delta\Psi}{\delta u_i^a(x)} \Big|_{u_0, u_1} + \delta^{(3)}(x - x_0) \frac{\partial\Psi}{\partial u_i^a(x_0)} + \delta^{(3)}(x - x_1) \frac{\partial\Psi}{\partial u_i^a(x_1)} , \quad (28)$$

where the functional derivative on the r.h.s. is taken with $u_i^a(x_0)$ and $u_i^a(x_1)$ fixed. Gauss' law becomes

$$\left(\epsilon^{abc} u_i^b(x_0) \frac{\partial}{\partial u_i^c(x_0)} - i\Lambda^{a*} \right) \Psi_{\alpha\beta} = 0 \quad (29)$$

at x_0 ,

$$\left(\epsilon^{abc} u_i^b(x_1) \frac{\partial}{\partial u_i^c(x_1)} + i\Lambda^a \right) \Psi_{\alpha\beta} = 0 \quad (30)$$

at x_1 , and

$$\epsilon^{abc} u_i^b(x) \frac{\delta\Psi_{\alpha\beta}}{\delta u_i^a(x)} \Big|_{u_0, u_1} = 0 . \quad (31)$$

If we associate Euler angles $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)_0$ and $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)_1$ to each of the tetrahedra $u_i^a(x_0)$ and $u_i^a(x_1)$, the rotation generators in Eqs. (29,30) become the angular momentum operators

$$J_3 = -i \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha} \quad (32)$$

$$J_{\pm} = e^{\pm i\alpha} \left[\pm \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} + \frac{1}{\sin \beta} \left(\frac{1}{i} \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma} - \cos \beta \frac{1}{i} \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha} \right) \right] ,$$

at x_0 and x_1 , with $J_{\pm} = J_1 \pm iJ_2$.

The solution to Eqs. (29,30) is well-known from the representation theory of $SU(2)$. If the Λ^a belong to the spin- j representation, it is given by the Wigner $\mathcal{D}^{(j)}$ functions, which satisfy:

$$J^a \mathcal{D}_{mm'}^{(j)} = -\Lambda_{mn}^a \mathcal{D}_{nm'}^{(j)} , \quad (33)$$

where m, m', n span integer values from $-j$ to j . In the case of interest for us, $j = 1/2$, Λ^a are the Pauli matrices $\tau^a/2$, and the complete solution to Eqs. (29-31) is given by:

$$\Psi_{\alpha\beta} = \mathcal{D}_{\alpha m}^{(1/2)}((\alpha, \beta, \gamma)_1) \mathcal{D}_{\beta n}^{(1/2)*}((\alpha, \beta, \gamma)_0) \Phi^{mn}[g_{ij}] , \quad (34)$$

where $\Phi^{mn}[g_{ij}]$ are four arbitrary gauge-invariant functionals (and thus functionals of g_{ij} only), with no particular symmetry associated to the indices m, n . These indices m, n live in the same (spin-1/2) space as α, β , however, they are denoted in this way precisely to indicate the lack of any symmetry covariance associated to them, as far as Gauss' law is concerned. The $\mathcal{D}^{(1/2)}$ matrices appearing above are given by:

$$\mathcal{D}_{mn}^{(1/2)}(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-\frac{i}{2}(\alpha+\gamma)} \cos \beta/2 & -e^{-\frac{i}{2}(\alpha-\gamma)} \sin \beta/2 \\ e^{\frac{i}{2}(\alpha-\gamma)} \sin \beta/2 & e^{\frac{i}{2}(\alpha+\gamma)} \cos \beta/2 \end{pmatrix} . \quad (35)$$

One more time, it seems we have been able to solve Gauss' law in the presence of two sources. Furthermore, it also seems we have eliminated the problem of introducing “too

much” of the electric field propagating between the two points. In fact, in this solution the points x_0 and x_1 are entirely disconnected: to a given configuration $A_i^a(x)$ is associated a configuration of Euler angles at each point in space, $(\alpha(x), \beta(x), \gamma(x))$, and to build Eq. (34), one simply reads off the values of these angles at x_0 and x_1 .

But now it becomes clear that we have eliminated the previous problem at the cost of introducing another type of extraneous divergence, and this solution will also have to be discarded. The problem lies in the fact that the Euler angle variables appearing in the angular momentum operators, Eq. (32), originate in an integer-spin representation of $SU(2)$, and thus take values in the $SO(3)$ range $0 \leq \alpha < 2\pi, 0 \leq \beta \leq \pi, 0 \leq \gamma < 2\pi$ (after all, they represent rotations of a tetrahedron in $\mathbb{R}^3$). It is in this $SO(3)$ range that Eqs. (29,30) must be solved. However, by the time we solve them for $j = 1/2$ sources, Eqs. (34,35), we have had to resort to the fundamental representation of $SU(2)$, which is a double-valued representation of $SO(3)$, with range $0 \leq \alpha < 4\pi, 0 \leq \beta \leq \pi, 0 \leq \gamma < 2\pi$. This means that when α (at either x_0 or x_1) is rotated by 2π , which is no change at all in the $SO(3)$ degrees of freedom, this solution changes sign. From the $SO(3)$ viewpoint, the $\mathcal{D}^{1/2}$ matrices undergo a discontinuous jump between $\alpha=2\pi$ and $\alpha=0$. Of course, this has happened because local solutions such as Eq. (34) cannot be expected to automatically discern between $SU(2)$ and $SO(3)$ degrees of freedom, a question which can only be decided at a global level. We are thus led to discard Eq. (34) as an appropriate solution to the Gauss law constraint with fundamental sources due to the double-valued and non-analytic nature of this solution. We also see, on the other hand, that the situation is entirely different with adjoint sources, where a solution would be Eq. (34) with the substitution $\mathcal{D}^{(1/2)} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}^{(1)}$ or, equivalently,

$$\Psi^{ab} = u_i^a(x_1)u_j^b(x_0)\Phi^{ij}[g] . \quad (36)$$

It is trivial to see that this satisfies Eqs. (29,30) with Λ^a in the adjoint and, in this case, Ψ would in fact be a single-valued function of the Euler angles in the $SO(3)$ domain. We would furthermore be able to conclude that in this case no line appears connecting the points x_0 and x_1 , much like in the abelian case, and this seems to indicate there should not be a confining potential between these sources. At the same time, there are clear indications from lattice calculations [7] that for a certain range of distances between the confinement and color screening scales, adjoint and higher representation Wilson loops do experience an area law behavior with a string tension proportional to the quadratic Casimir of the representation. While we are not questioning these results, what our results point out, however, is that one should exercise much caution in directly translating these Wilson loop scalings into the true potential experienced by static quarks.

In attempting to find an appropriate solution to Eqs. (29-31) with sources in the fundamental, we are guided by the following prerequisites: *i)* we should not introduce all of the vector potential in a Wilson line prefactor, but rather only the “gauge part” of it, and *ii)* we should seek a functional which is an analytic function of the gauge variables in the $SO(3)$ domain, so that the wavefunctional belongs to the correct Hilbert space. In separating the gauge part of the vector potential, the u_i^a variables are again very useful. For, if we imagine that to each possible tetrahedron in space we associate a unique triplet of vectors $v_i^a(x)$, then the u_i^a variables will in general be $SO(3)$ rotations of these,

$$u_i^a(x) = U^{ab}(x)v_i^b(x) , \quad (37)$$

under gauge transformations. One must of course find a systematic way to assign a unique v_i^a to each tetrahedron, and once that is done, the purely gauge degrees of freedom become neatly separated in Eq. (37). Although it is not of central importance for our purposes here, we briefly describe how tetrahedra are associated to v_i^a : given a tetrahedron, we align its longest edge with the z -axis with one vertex at the origin; we then align the longest edge connected to this first edge to lie on the left xz -plane ($x < 0$), also with one vertex at the origin. Then the last vertex will lie somewhere in $\mathbb{R}^3$. The v_i^a are then given by the three vectors describing the edges emanating from the origin, and some thought shows that the integration over gauge-inequivalent configurations corresponds to

$$\int_0^\infty dr_1 \int_0^{r_1} dr_2 \int_0^{r_2} dr_3 \int_0^\pi d\theta_{12} \int_0^\pi d\theta_{13} \int_0^{2\pi} d\phi, \quad (38)$$

where $r_i = \sqrt{v_i^a v_i^a} = \sqrt{g_{ii}}$, $\theta_{ij} = v_i^a v_j^a / r_i r_j = g_{ij} / \sqrt{g_{ii} g_{jj}}$ (no sum in i or j in these expressions), and ϕ is the azimuthal angle of v_3^a (the vector not lying in the xz -plane).

This separation of gauge- and gauge-invariant variations is sufficient to build the wavefunctional we seek: it will be given by associating the U^{ab} , corresponding to a particular u_i^a , to a pure gauge vector potential

$$U^{ab} \longrightarrow (\mathcal{A}_i)_{\alpha\beta}(x) \equiv -\frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{abc}U^{bb'}(x)\partial_i U^{cb'}(x)(\tau^a/2)_{\alpha\beta}. \quad (39)$$

This vector potential is then used in constructing the Wilson line prefactor, leading to the candidate wavefunctional

$$\Psi_{\alpha\beta} = P \left(e^{i \int_{x_0}^{x_1} dx^m \mathcal{A}_m(x)} \right)_{\alpha\beta} \Phi[g] \equiv F_{\alpha\beta} \Phi[g]. \quad (40)$$

It is worthwhile to work out the gauge transformation properties of this wavefunctional in order to clarify the issues of analyticity and center symmetry. This is done by looking at the regularized form of its infinite product representation:

$$F^{\text{reg}} = \prod_{n=1}^N (1 + i dx_n^i \mathcal{A}_i(x_n)), \quad (41)$$

where we understand the curve connecting x_0 and x_1 to be divided into a large number N of segments at the points $\{x_n\}$, and $\mathcal{A}_i = \mathcal{A}_i^a \tau^a / 2$. The first term in this product is

$$(1 + i dx_1^i \mathcal{A}_i(x_1))_{\alpha\beta} = \delta_{\alpha\beta} - \frac{i}{2}\epsilon^{abc}U^{bb'}(x_1)dU^{cb'}(x_1)\left(\frac{\tau^a}{2}\right)_{\alpha\beta}, \quad (42)$$

with $dU^{ab}(x_1) \equiv dx_1^i \partial_i U^{ab}(x_1)$. The standard commutation and anticommutation relations of Pauli matrices then lead to

$$(1 + i dx_1^i \mathcal{A}_i(x_1))_{\alpha\beta} = \left(\frac{\tau^a}{2} \frac{\tau^b}{2}\right)_{\alpha\beta} \left(\frac{1}{3}\delta^{ab} + U^{ab'}(x_1)U^{bb'}(x_2)\right) \quad (43)$$

to linear order, where $x_2 = x_1 - dx_1$. One then uses the standard 2:1 map between $SU(2)$ and $SO(3)$,

$$U_{\alpha\alpha'}\left(\frac{\tau^a}{2}\right)_{\alpha'\beta'}U_{\beta'\beta}^{-1}=U^{ba}\left(\frac{\tau^b}{2}\right)_{\alpha\beta}, \quad (44)$$

and the “spin-permutation” identity

$$\left(\frac{\tau^a}{2}\right)_{\alpha\beta}\left(\frac{\tau^a}{2}\right)_{\alpha'\beta'}=\frac{1}{2}\left(\delta_{\alpha\beta'}\delta_{\beta\alpha'}-\frac{1}{2}\delta_{\alpha\beta}\delta_{\alpha'\beta'}\right), \quad (45)$$

to finally write

$$(1+idx_1^i\mathcal{A}_i(x_1))_{\alpha\beta}=\left(U(x_1)U^\dagger(x_2)\right)_{\alpha\beta}\left[\frac{1}{2}\text{tr}_f(U(x_1)U^\dagger(x_2))\right], \quad (46)$$

with tr_f being the trace in the fundamental. All N terms in the product can now be put together to obtain

$$F_{\alpha\beta}^{\text{reg}}=(U(x_1)U^\dagger(x_0))_{\alpha\beta}\left[\frac{1}{2}\text{tr}_f(U(x_1)U^\dagger(x_2))\right]\dots\left[\frac{1}{2}\text{tr}_f(U(x_N)U^\dagger(x_0))\right]. \quad (47)$$

In the continuum limit one might be tempted to simply drop the infinite trace term since each trace involves two matrices which are very close together, and to linear order differ by an element of the algebra, which is traceless. This is almost correct, except for the fact that it endows the path ordered exponential with the $SO(3)$ analyticity we have to require of state wavefunctionals. That this is so can be seen as follows: we would like our candidate wavefunctional, Eq. (40), to be invariant under the $SO(3)$ -periodic change $\alpha \rightarrow \alpha + 2\pi$, independently at x_0 and x_1 . This is equivalent to making a singular gauge transformation equal to the identity everywhere except for one of the points x_0 or x_1 , where it is equal to a rotation of 2π around the z -axis. Then, either $U(x_1)$ or $U(x_0)$ will change sign, but since F^{reg} is quadratic in the fundamental matrices at every point, it will remain invariant. By simply dropping the trace term, this periodicity would be broken. It is this analyticity in the $SO(3)$ domain that we must preserve in taking the continuum limit of Eq. (47). Due to continuity, furthermore, the trace factor allows for a *definition* of the angles at x_1 starting from a given convention for angles at x_0 . Thus, if the angles at x_0 are taken to be in the $SO(3)$ domain, then, in the continuum limit, the angles at x_1 will be given by

$$\alpha^C(x_1)=\alpha(x_0)+\int_C dx^i\partial_i\alpha(x), \quad (48)$$

and likewise for $\beta^C(x_1)$ and $\gamma^C(x_1)$, where we write the superscript C over the angles simply to differentiate them from the angles obtained by simply reading them off at the point x_1 , as in the previous solution (thus, angles at x_1 have unlimited range). With this definition of angles at x_1 , we are now ready to drop the trace factors and take the continuum limit for F :

$$F_{\alpha\beta}^C=(U^C(x_1)U^\dagger(x_0))_{\alpha\beta}=\mathcal{D}_{\alpha\gamma}^{(1/2)}((\alpha,\beta,\gamma)_1^C)\mathcal{D}_{\beta\gamma}^{(1/2)*}((\alpha,\beta,\gamma)_0). \quad (49)$$

This represents Eq. (40) in a more explicit form. We note that it satisfies Gauss’ law while at the same time being periodic in the $SO(3)$ domain. This is achieved through a residual dependence on the line connecting the two charges. Yet, it is very similar to the

local solution Eq. (34), as it must be since both satisfy the same local gauge invariance constraint. Furthermore, it emulates the abelian case in the closest possible form, insofar as only gauge degrees of freedom are introduced to “communicate” between the two charges.

It is worthwhile noting that if one were to form a fundamental Wilson loop in the fashion spelled out above, then it would transform with a Z_2 factor, ± 1 , under gauge transformations, with the specific sign being determined by the number of vortex-like singularities in the gauge transformation that pierced a surface bounded by the loop. This is most clearly illustrated by a gauge transformation with a single infinite vortex along the z -axis, which can be described as follows:

$$\alpha(x, y, z) = \tan^{-1} \frac{y}{x} , \quad (50)$$

and $\beta(x, y, z) = \gamma(x, y, z) = 0$. Then, the Wilson loop will acquire a minus sign under this gauge transformation if and only if it encircles the z -axis an odd number of times. This shows how our analyticity requirement leads to a natural realization of 't Hooft's operator algebra [2]

$$A(C)B(C') = e^{2\pi i n/N} B(C')A(C) , \quad (51)$$

where (in the notation of [2]) $A(C)$ is a Wilson loop around C and $B(C')$ is the operator which creates a vortex at C' . For $SU(2)/Z_2$ gauge group, the phase on the r.h.s. above is equal to the $(\pm) Z_2$ factor described previously. If the gauge group were $SU(2)$ rather than $SO(3)$ this Z_2 factor would naturally be absent, and Wilson loops would be gauge invariant: in that case each point in space is uniquely associated to an $SU(2)$ matrix and thus the matrices which transform the endpoints of a Wilson line become one and the same when the endpoints meet, and the transformation vanishes in the trace.

It should also be noted that in order to achieve an expression for the wavefunctional of two sources which does not single out a preferred curve, one must naturally consider wavefunctionals which are linear combinations of the ones just described, going over different curves connecting the two charges, with some weighting factor $w(C)$:

$$\Psi_{\alpha\beta} = \sum_C w(C) F_{\alpha\beta}^C \Phi[g] . \quad (52)$$

With such wavefunctionals at hand, one may of course then attempt to argue that confinement comes about due to random vortex fluctuations in the vacuum, as in the standard Z_N vortex condensation picture [2]. At this point, however, we would rather refrain from such speculations.

We finally observe that it is possible to exhibit the different wavefunctionals considered here by means of a description which is independent of the use of gauge covariant variables. If we imagine one were to select a family of gauge potentials, $\hat{A}_i^a$, that crossed once and only once each gauge orbit, then any gauge potential A_i^a would be related to one of the $\hat{A}_i^a$ through a gauge transformation (of course, trying to achieve such a family of $\hat{A}_i^a$ through a gauge condition inevitably leads to Gribov ambiguities, but as long as we do not choose gauge conditions we are free to assume the existence of the $\hat{A}_i^a$ unambiguously). Then, the generic solution to the Gauss law constraint should, strictly speaking, be

$$\Psi_{\alpha\beta}[A] = U_{\alpha m}(x_1) U_{\beta n}^*(x_0) \Phi^{mn}[\hat{A}] , \quad (53)$$

where $U_{\alpha\beta}$ is the gauge transformation relating A_i^a and $\hat{A}_i^a$, and $\Phi^{mn}[\hat{A}]$ is to be determined by a dynamical calculation in the vacuum sector. The wavefunctional sometimes presented in the literature, gotten by acting with a fundamental Wilson line on the vacuum state is

$$\Psi_{\alpha\beta}[A] = P \left(e^{i \int A \cdot \tau / 2} \right)_{\alpha\beta} \Phi_{\text{vac}}[\hat{A}] \quad (54)$$

$$= U_{\alpha m}(x_1) U_{\beta n}^*(x_0) \left[P \left(e^{i \int \hat{A} \cdot \tau / 2} \right)^{mn} \Phi_{\text{vac}}[\hat{A}] \right] . \quad (55)$$

It clearly suffers from the same problem as the incorrect wavefunctional in the abelian case, namely, the introduction of too many gauge quanta propagating between the two sources. Our solution, Eq. (40), would on the other hand, correspond to

$$\Psi_{\alpha\beta}[A] = U_{\alpha m}(x_1) U_{\beta n}^*(x_0) \left[\delta^{mn} \Phi_{\text{vac}}[\hat{A}] \right] \quad (56)$$

$$= \left(U(x_1) U(x_0)^\dagger \right)_{\alpha\beta} \Phi_{\text{vac}}[\hat{A}] . \quad (57)$$

Of course, this description cannot be carried on much further, as we have no handle on how to describe the unique gauge slice $\hat{A}_i^a$.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

We have investigated here the form state functionals should take in the presence of two static charges, both in abelian and in $SU(2)$ gauge theory. Part of the motivation for such an investigation was the fact that the functionals which are suggested by the form Wilson loops take, are incorrect, and generate a confining static potential even where there is no confinement. In the abelian case, we have shown how the static Coulomb potential arises in a considerably more direct fashion through Schrödinger-picture methods than through Wilson loop expectation values. Another part of our motivation was to extend this treatment to the nonabelian theory, by exploring the gauge covariant description of the Hilbert space that we have proposed in previous work. In the nonabelian case, the use of gauge covariant variables has shown to be well-suited to the problem, as they allow for a direct solution of the Gauss law constraint before the dynamical problem is tackled. Their use, furthermore, together with an analyticity requirement, also led to a simple and explicit realization of the center symmetry of the theory.

The extension to gauge group $SU(3)$ should be essentially straightforward, whereas the actual dynamical problem of determining the static potential does present considerable technical difficulties. We have begun such an investigation, and hope to report on it in the near future.

V. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is a pleasure to thank our friends and colleagues Shailesh Chandrasekharan, Poul Henrik Damgaard, Andrei Matytsin and Uwe-Jens Wiese for many pleasant and informative discussions.

REFERENCES

- [1] P.E. Haagensen and K. Johnson, *Nucl. Phys.* **B439** (1995) 597; P.E. Haagensen, K. Johnson and C.S. Lam, *Nucl. Phys.* **B477** (1996) 273.
- [2] G. 't Hooft, *Nucl. Phys.* **B138** (1978) 1.
- [3] G. 't Hooft, *Nucl. Phys.* **B153** (1979) 141.
- [4] K. Wilson, *Phys. Rev.* **D10** (1974) 2445; J.B. Kogut, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **55** (1983) 775.
- [5] P. Dirac, *Can. J. . Phys.* **33** (1955) 650.
- [6] A.M. Polyakov, *Nucl. Phys.* **B120** (1977) 429, sec. 5; A.M. Polyakov, “*Gauge Fields and Strings*” (Harwood, 1987); K. Wilson, in *Current Trends in the Theory of Fields*, Tallahassee 1978 (Am. Inst. of Phys., 1978).
- [7] J. Ambjørn, P. Olesen and C. Peterson, *Nucl. Phys.* **B240** [FS12] (1984) 189.